

G.F. 1925

212 9 25

SH. NO. 1K2

Proposes Certain amendments for the
consideration of Government in view to
revise the number of advances that
might be granted out of the State
Provident Fund amounts.

1925.6

File No. G.F. 212-2

Previous References

(G.F.)

Serial Nos. 142

Later references.

G.F. 71.27.122

G.F. 71.28.2

Liby. 86-388/12

Preserve
By 8/9/45

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Two

Part B for

✓ April 1926.

SUBJECT

Proposes certain amendments for the consideration of Government in view to reduce the number of advances that might be granted out of the State Provident Fund amounts.

Sho. 2.

To The Comptroller to Government.
The Other Heads of Departments.
The Deputy Commissioners of Dist.
N. F. C. 5838-5902 dated 8th April 26.

Approves of the proposals of the Comptroller in regard to the restrictions to be imposed on Provident Fund Advances

14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(G. F.)

NOTES.

File No. 2223

FILE HEADING.

Restrictions to reduce the number of advances under the State Provident Fund amounts.

From

The Comptroller

No. S.P.F. 169 Dated 8.2.1926 Received 10.2.1926

Diary No. 2922

Enclos. 1 Spare Copies. -

Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Proposes certain amendments for the consideration of Govt in view to reduce the number of advances that might be granted out of the State Provident Fund amounts.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

In para 2 of G.O. d/ 20th November 1925 the Comptroller was requested to suggest some restrictions that might be imposed in view to reduce the number of advances under

9.9 File No.

222.

of 1925

Serial
No

the State Provident Rules. He
has accordingly suggested
certain amendments.

Subd for orders.

~~806~~ ^{10/2}
10/2

The Comptroller suggestion which is the
same as now in force in Po. India may be
approved (vide letter of Part Account offr)

B
16/2

127

(Final Sec)

Please put up a complete copy
of Co. Do rules. only

18.2.26

Subd.

A copy of the G. 9. rules corrected up to end of July 1919
is put up.


By 20/2
[Signature]

The rules quoted by the Part Account
Officers apparently are subsidiary rules issued
by the Govt of India.

The first portion of the proposed amendment
follows Govt of India rule 20 note 3 with 3 months
substituted for one year.

B
22/2

1371 (28 Sec)



Serial
No

I am not sure if prohibitions in respect of purposes of advances will really result in reducing their number. We have no means of ascertaining for what purposes advances are really used and applicants may easily make incorrect statements when they know ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{Statements} they are not capable of verification. The only effective means of checking the number of advances is to impose a restriction in respect of the interval that should elapse between two advances. I would, therefore, suggest the addition of the following sentence to the present note (2) under Rule No.10 (c):-

"Except for strong reasons to be recorded in writing by the sanctioning authority, no new advance will be allowed until at least twelve months have elapsed since the date of the previous advance."

I shall be obliged for the views of the Comptroller on the above suggestion.

min 10-2 26

Unofficial No. 2031 SPF. dated 16th March 1926.

Returned with compliments. The Financial Secretary's suggestion which will tend to reduce the number of applications for such advances, may be given effect to, and the necessity for imposing further restrictions considered after a year or two.

J. P. Nayak
Comptroller.

B 18/3

213

1836 H (eg)



28-20-6-97-28
LS 00-3-28
38631

u.o. no. 226 87/7 26

General and Revenue
Secretariat

G.F. File No. 212

of 1925 .

Serial
No.

S (other side)

It was brought to the notice of Government by the Comptroller that applications for temporary advances from Provident Fund are frequent and on the increase. He was requested to suggest what restrictions may be imposed to reduce the number of advances and the connected unnecessary work. In his letter dated 8th February 1926, the Comptroller proposed the substitution of a new rule for Note (2) under Rule 10 (c), based on the Government of India rule, with the modification that there should be an interval of three months instead of twelve months after the complete repayment of the last advance taken. He has also proposed that the cases in which advances should not be permitted may be specified in the rule so as to reduce the occasion ^{for} of granting advances. Such a prohibition will not be very effective as there is no means of checking whether the advance taken was really utilised for the purpose mentioned in the application. The only effective means of checking the number of advances is to impose a restriction in respect of the interval that should elapse between two advances. ^{was} it ~~is~~, therefore, ^x ~~proposed~~ ^{in note of 10.2.26} to introduce the following sentence to the ^{present} ~~proposed~~ note (2) under Rule 10 (c):—

" Except for strong reasons to be recorded in writing by the sanctioning authority, no new advance will be allowed until, at least, twelve months have elapsed since the date of the previous advance."

^x The Comptroller who was consulted in the

N

2922
K

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-23

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 192 .

25 MAR 1926

1023

Serial
No.

in the matter has accepted the suggestion and
this may be approved.

DEWAN.)

h
25.3.26

B₂

Spec 4

25/3

Plum issue order to
Comptroller

h
20/3

B₂

Draft Sub E

2/4

Some

B
2/4

B₂

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The draft approved for
issue may be for multigraphs
with the permission of the
Registrar. 60 unsigned copies
and 100 signed copies may
be ordered to be multigraphed.
Number & date ~~of the~~
G.O. will be ^{put in} ~~inserted~~ when the
proof is finally approved.
or when the draft is sent to the
Multigraph section.

By 5/4
~~5/4~~

Ys
B
5/4


Rep with Compts

To Mult Sec^m for compliance
6.4

203

B

C. O. 42. Gl.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.No. SPF.169. *Yone.*Bangalore, Dated... 8th February... 1926. *2922*T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, Esq., B. A.,
Comptroller to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

19 25 - 1926
Section. <i>G. 7.</i>
No. <i>212</i>
Serial No. <i>1 2-50</i>

Rajakaryaprasaktha Dewan Bahadur
M.N. Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department.

10. FEB. 1926

Sir,

With reference to the concluding para of Government Order No. F1.2769-828/GF.97-25-2 dated 20th November 1925 (reviewing the Annual Report on the working of State Provident Fund) asking me to suggest what restrictions may be imposed to reduce the number of advances to be granted out of State Provident Fund amounts, I have the honour to state that the Government of India rules were consulted in this respect and I accordingly propose for the consideration of Government the following amendment :-

Substitute the following for note (2) under clause (c) Rule 10.

"When one or more advances have already been granted to a subscriber a subsequent advance shall not be granted to him, except for strong reasons to be recorded in ~~the~~ writing by the sanctioning authority, ^{until} noted at least 3 ~~18~~ months have elapsed since the complete repayment of the last advance taken. If the second advance is granted as a special case, the balance of previous advance if any, should be deducted. The Account officer should bring to notice instances in which the spirit of the instruction appears to be destroyed *disregarded*."

Introduce the following as Note (3). ³

The following are the occasions which should not be considered as legitimate for purposes of advances:-

1. Discharge of ordinary indebtedness.
2. Admission of a son to college training.
3. Building or buying a house.
4. Change of climate.
5. Purchase of furniture to set up a house.

I also enclose a copy of letter No.P&A/Fds.3946 dated 22nd December, 1925 received from the Pay and Account Officer, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore to whom a reference was made to ascertain the procedure in vogue in Madras on the subject.

An interval of 3 months is proposed as the time that should elapse since the complete repayment of the last advance taken, in lieu of 12 months fixed in the corresponding rules in the Government of India as some such restriction appears necessary.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

J. Satyanarayana
Comptroller.

Q13

Letter No.P&A/Fds.3946 dated 22nd December 1925 from the Pay and Account Officer, C & M Station, Bangalore ~~to~~ to the Comptroller of Mysore, Bangalore.

With reference to your letter No.S.P.F.104 dated 3-12-1925, I have the honour to state as follows.

Rules exist for the General Provident Fund in British India imposing restrictions not only on the grant of first advance but also on subsequent ones. It is observed that the legitimate occasions for the grant of an advance given as illustrative examples in Rule 10 of the State Provident Fund Rules are practically the same as those in the General Provident Rule. The Government of India have issued further orders from time to time specifying the occasions which should not be considered as legitimate for purposes of advances and they are given below :-

1. Discharge of ordinary indebtedness.
2. Admission of a son to College training.
3. Building or buying a house.
4. Change of climate.
5. Purchase of furniture to set up a house.
6. Marriage of Europeans.

It will perhaps be useful to include in the State Provident Fund Rule a similar list after examining the occasions on which advances have so far been ~~xx~~ granted.

3. The latter portion of note 2 to the State Provident Fund Rules allow a second advance if the unpaid portion of the first advance is refunded a once by deduction from the new advance, tends as pointed out by you, to a misuse of the Fund. The relevant rule in this connection in the General Provident Fund Rules is extracted below for your information.

"When one or more advances have already been granted to a subscriber, a subsequent advance shall not be granted to him, except for strong reasons to be recorded in writing by the sanctioning authority until at least 12 months have elapsed since the complete repayment of the last advance taken. The Account Officer should bring to notice instances in which the spirit of this instruction appears to be disregarded".

4. The number of advances is not restricted in the case of the General Provident Fund, as the restrictions imposed as regards (1) occasions on

which an advance can be taken, as well as (2) the requirement of a minimum time limit between an advance and a subsequent one and (3) the discretion vested in the sanctioning authority to refuse an advance when he is not satisfied as to its necessity, are expected to prevent misuse.

5. I regret that no corrected copy of the rules is available in my office. The copy of the State Provident Fund Rules received with your letter is herewith returned.

"Copy"

W. D. W. Ray

Superintendent,
Record Section,
Comptroller's Office.

913

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

, the 192

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

May this be

- i Printed ?
- ii treated as a standing order ?
- iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?
- iv translated ?
- v placed at the disposal of the press ?
- vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section G.F
File No. 212-25
Serial No. 2

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read—

Go. no: 70 2769-828/G.F
97-25-2 dated 20/11/1925 —
reviewing the report on the
working of the State Provident
Fund for the year 1924-25
and requesting the Comptroller
to Govt. ~~requesting~~ to suggest
what restrictions may be imposed
to reduce the number of —
Order Thereon No.
~~advances~~ temporary advances
and the connected unnecessary
work.
2. Correspondence ending
with U.O. No. 203/S.P.F

from the Comp. to Govt
dated 16/3/1926, stating that
the following addition may
be made to the present note (2)
under Rule no 10 (c) of the State
Provident Fund Rules ~~which~~ ^{and stating that it}
will tend to reduce the
number of applications for
such advances.

" Except for strong reasons
to be recorded in writing by the
sanctioning authority, no new
advance will be allowed, until,
at least, twelve months have
elapsed since the date of
the previous advance."

order #15838-5902/

Approved.

List of enclosures.

1/4
For Finl. Secy. to Govt

Copied by

Examined by

The Comp. to Govt

^{other}
The Hds. of Sdpts.

The Dy. Secy. to Govt.

S. O. G.

**Government of His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore.**

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS

G. O. No. Fl. 5838-5902/G. F. 212-25-2 Bangalore, Dated, 8th April 1926.

Provident Fund Advances

Approves of the proposals of the Comptroller in regard to the restrictions to be imposed on-----

Read:--

Government Order No. Fl. 2769-828/G.F. 97-25-2 dated 20th November 1925 reviewing the report on the working of the State Provident Fund for the year 1924-25 and requesting the Comptroller to Government to suggest what restrictions may be imposed to reduce the number of temporary advances and the connected unnecessary work.

2. Correspondence ending with U.O. Note No. 203/S.P.F. dated 16th March 1926 from the Comptroller to Government stating that the following addition may be made to the present note (2) under Rule No. 10 (c) of the State Provident Fund Rules and stating that it will tend to reduce the number of applications for such advances.

"Except for strong reasons to be recorded in writing by the sanctioning authority, no new advance will be allowed, until, at least, twelve months have elapsed since the date of the previous advance".

ORDER NO. 5838-5902/G.F. 212-25-2 DATED 8TH APRIL 1926.

Approved.

B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR,
Offg. Financial Secretary to Government.

To--The Comptroller to Government.
The other Heads of Departments.
The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.